

THE EVENING STAR.

With Sunday Morning Edition.

WASHINGTON, SUNDAY, APRIL 13, 1913

THEODORE W. NOYES, Editor

The Evening Star Newspaper Company.

Business Office, 11th St. and Pennsylvania Avenue, N. W., New York Office, Tribune Building, Chicago Office, First National Bank Building, European Office, Regent St., London, England.

The Evening Star, with the Sunday morning edition, is delivered by carriers within the city at 45 cents per month; fully paid, 25 cents per month; Sunday only, 10 cents per month. Orders for delivery by mail, or by telephone Main 2440. Collection is made by carrier at the end of each month.

Entered as second-class mail matter at the post office at Washington, D. C.

In order to avoid delays on account of personal absence, letters to THE STAR, or to any of its editorial departments, should be addressed to the office, but simply to THE STAR, or to the Editor or Business Department, according to the nature of the communication.

The Constitution Under Fire.

According to an announcement, there is to be a debate next fall, "from coast to coast," between Rev. Herbert S. Bigelow of Ohio and former Gov. Hanley of Indiana on this question: "Resolved, That the federal Constitution is outgrown and obsolete and should be amended or replaced by a new one."

Mr. Bigelow will take the negative side of the proposition.

Mr. Bigelow was a lieutenant of the late Tom L. Johnson, and learned his politics from him.

He was a prominent figure in Ohio, and advocated many of the things that were incorporated into that remarkable document.

He is a man of extreme political views. Mr. Hanley is a republican, has held office as such, and still holds the faith.

Neither of these men is a national figure, both are of enough consequence to insure for their deliberations on this most interesting subject wide attention, and they may draw into the field of discussion men of greater size.

And by starting the "ball rolling" this spring, they will give time for the crystallizing of much sentiment before the congressional elections of next year, which, as all concede, will be warmly contested and have a strong bearing on the presidential contest three years hence.

Bigelow thinks the Constitution a blot on progress. So do many men who call themselves reformers. He would cast it aside for something modern and up-to-date. So would many men now training in the old camps. He does not deny that for a long time the men scattered over the country who are despairing of both of the old parties as instruments for further safe government.

The argument—or rather the assertion—is that the fathers performed valuable service according to their lights and time. They knew their surroundings and immediate needs. Praise to them for that. But present day glorification of them is unwise, and even dangerous. Dead hands should no longer guide us. Spirits from urns should no longer govern.

It was a Mr. Robinson, celebrated by a celebrated American poet, who took similar ground as respected the Scriptures: "John P. Robinson, he didn't know everything. And yet the Scriptures have survived."

Down in Judea.

And maybe the Constitution will survive. Still, let us have a full bill of particulars from those who have outgrown it. What, in detail, would they put in its place? What, in their opinion, is the full demand of the times?

The Housing of Diplomats.

Opposition is expressed in some quarters to the idea of providing funds for the rental of homes for ambassadors and ministers at foreign capitals and for furnishing and equipping them. It is suggested that foreign representatives are no longer as foreign as they once were; that the state department and foreign offices, by direct communications, are able to carry on most of the important business between the nations, and the ambassadors and ministers are left to the foreign capital as a mere show.

It is to be obtained, the logical step is to abandon all of the embassies and legations and to establish merely consular agents at the foreign capitals for the transaction of the actual business of international relations.

The United States would readier if an object of wonderment on the part of all the world. This would certainly be a very risky undertaking. This country has now such widespread interests, covering all parts of the world, that it should be quite certain of full representation everywhere, and unless it is definitely going out of business as a world power it cannot afford to reduce its communications to the basis of mails and cables. If ambassadors and ministers are to be abandoned, the foreign capital that they should be decently provided with the necessities of life. It is practically impossible for a man to occupy one of these positions without some personal sacrifice. The only way in which he can maintain his position and draw his salary is by private funds. It is in quarters scarcely comparable with those occupied by the representatives of fifth rate states. Thus, short of the reduction of our diplomatic representation to a bare consular basis, the United States is compelled under the present arrangement to name for these positions men who are able and willing to pay for adequate housing out of their own pockets. The way out for the government to provide its representatives with adequate quarters.

In several states it seems desirable to go to some pains to impress the fact that no true lady puts arsenic in her husband's coffee.

Harry Thaw continues to demonstrate that consignment to Matteawan does not necessarily imply a retirement from public life.

The Dingley Law.

For the purpose probably of "rattling" the democrats, there is a revival of the notion that only the war with Spain successfully prosecuted under a republican administration, saved that party from defeat in 1900. Mr. McKinley won on the prestige of a military success. Otherwise, the Dingley tariff law would have defeated him.

Mr. McKinley would have won if America and Spain had exchanged bouquets instead of bullets about Cuba. The war had nothing to do with his re-election. The conflict had not been a partisan one, except in so far as the democrats claimed they had forced the administration into action. Champ Clark

declared that the democrats had taken the republicans by "the scruff of the neck" and made them fight. But that, of course, was a mere flourish; "a tease" in debate.

The war once begun—reluctantly on Mr. McKinley's part—had been prosecuted with vigor, both democrats and republicans responding with enthusiasm, and in the campaign of 1900 this fact stood out plainly. Had he tried, Mr. McKinley could not have made good solely or principally on his part in it.

He won largely on the Dingley law. He had come in four years before on a promise of tariff revision which would "reopen the mills," and the Dingley law, in part shaped and signed by him, had accomplished that purpose. By 1900, business, which had languished under the Cleveland administration, was again booming, and labor, which had been on its uppers, was again employed, and earning more than three times a day if it so desired.

The law had succeeded because it had been honestly drawn in redemption of a campaign promise made after an honest study of business needs and conditions. It was not a mere flourish, it was protection, and here it was, undisturbed in legislation. And protection had proved to be the remedy for the Cleveland fight. Hence the strength of the republican appeal when Mr. McKinley offered for reelection.

The lesson in that record for the democrats at this time is that honesty is the best policy. Huggmugger, when it succeeds at all, succeeds but for a day. The republicans, believing in protection, promised it, and, having promised it, gave it. They were rewarded with a long lease of power. They won in that year, again in 1900, again in 1904 and again in 1908.

The democrats last year diagnosed the case too much protection, they proposed tariff revision, and revenue laws, and tariff revision, and revenue laws. Let them keep their promise now, and abide by the result. Huggmugger wins, when at all, but temporarily. They played that game twenty years ago, and lost by it. Better lose, if loss is to come, by a square reversion to square dealing, than by a trickery compromise. A compromise is necessary, and will be made, but a tricky one will be disastrous to its inventors.

Mr. Wilson and Tammany.

New York democrats opposed to Tammany are asking the President to ignore that organization in the distribution of patronage. They do not want it to get even a cold potato, much less a piece of pie.

What says Mr. Wilson?

It is the policy of Mr. Wilson, Mr. Wilson cannot have forgotten Baltimore, and to remember Baltimore is to remember Tammany. Mr. Murphy did his best at the national convention against Mr. Wilson, and only the nerve and staying quality of Mr. Wilson's campaign made him a man of triumph.

It was Mr. Wilson's denunciation of the anti-Wilson influences at work through the New Jersey delegation that saved the day for the Jersey candidate.

Tammany, it is true, accepted the ticket with good grace and worked for its success in November. The organization, in all its history, has seldom been irregular. It has bestirred itself more in some campaigns than in others, but, generally, it has done its best for the party. Last year it managed to get the braves to the polls.

But while Mr. Wilson has no ground to love Tammany, and may even feel a repugnance to such company, there is reason why at this time he should be cautious about administering punishment. A man who has a full bill of particulars from those who have outgrown it. What, in detail, would they put in its place? What, in their opinion, is the full demand of the times?

And maybe the Constitution will survive. Still, let us have a full bill of particulars from those who have outgrown it. What, in detail, would they put in its place? What, in their opinion, is the full demand of the times?

The Housing of Diplomats.

Opposition is expressed in some quarters to the idea of providing funds for the rental of homes for ambassadors and ministers at foreign capitals and for furnishing and equipping them. It is suggested that foreign representatives are no longer as foreign as they once were; that the state department and foreign offices, by direct communications, are able to carry on most of the important business between the nations, and the ambassadors and ministers are left to the foreign capital as a mere show.

It is to be obtained, the logical step is to abandon all of the embassies and legations and to establish merely consular agents at the foreign capitals for the transaction of the actual business of international relations.

The United States would readier if an object of wonderment on the part of all the world. This would certainly be a very risky undertaking. This country has now such widespread interests, covering all parts of the world, that it should be quite certain of full representation everywhere, and unless it is definitely going out of business as a world power it cannot afford to reduce its communications to the basis of mails and cables. If ambassadors and ministers are to be abandoned, the foreign capital that they should be decently provided with the necessities of life. It is practically impossible for a man to occupy one of these positions without some personal sacrifice. The only way in which he can maintain his position and draw his salary is by private funds. It is in quarters scarcely comparable with those occupied by the representatives of fifth rate states. Thus, short of the reduction of our diplomatic representation to a bare consular basis, the United States is compelled under the present arrangement to name for these positions men who are able and willing to pay for adequate housing out of their own pockets. The way out for the government to provide its representatives with adequate quarters.

In several states it seems desirable to go to some pains to impress the fact that no true lady puts arsenic in her husband's coffee.

Harry Thaw continues to demonstrate that consignment to Matteawan does not necessarily imply a retirement from public life.

The Dingley Law.

For the purpose probably of "rattling" the democrats, there is a revival of the notion that only the war with Spain successfully prosecuted under a republican administration, saved that party from defeat in 1900. Mr. McKinley won on the prestige of a military success. Otherwise, the Dingley tariff law would have defeated him.

Mr. McKinley would have won if America and Spain had exchanged bouquets instead of bullets about Cuba. The war had nothing to do with his re-election. The conflict had not been a partisan one, except in so far as the democrats claimed they had forced the administration into action. Champ Clark

declared that the democrats had taken the republicans by "the scruff of the neck" and made them fight. But that, of course, was a mere flourish; "a tease" in debate.

The war once begun—reluctantly on Mr. McKinley's part—had been prosecuted with vigor, both democrats and republicans responding with enthusiasm, and in the campaign of 1900 this fact stood out plainly. Had he tried, Mr. McKinley could not have made good solely or principally on his part in it.

He won largely on the Dingley law. He had come in four years before on a promise of tariff revision which would "reopen the mills," and the Dingley law, in part shaped and signed by him, had accomplished that purpose. By 1900, business, which had languished under the Cleveland administration, was again booming, and labor, which had been on its uppers, was again employed, and earning more than three times a day if it so desired.

The law had succeeded because it had been honestly drawn in redemption of a campaign promise made after an honest study of business needs and conditions. It was not a mere flourish, it was protection, and here it was, undisturbed in legislation. And protection had proved to be the remedy for the Cleveland fight. Hence the strength of the republican appeal when Mr. McKinley offered for reelection.

The lesson in that record for the democrats at this time is that honesty is the best policy. Huggmugger, when it succeeds at all, succeeds but for a day. The republicans, believing in protection, promised it, and, having promised it, gave it. They were rewarded with a long lease of power. They won in that year, again in 1900, again in 1904 and again in 1908.

The democrats last year diagnosed the case too much protection, they proposed tariff revision, and revenue laws, and tariff revision, and revenue laws. Let them keep their promise now, and abide by the result. Huggmugger wins, when at all, but temporarily. They played that game twenty years ago, and lost by it. Better lose, if loss is to come, by a square reversion to square dealing, than by a trickery compromise. A compromise is necessary, and will be made, but a tricky one will be disastrous to its inventors.

Mr. Wilson and Tammany.

New York democrats opposed to Tammany are asking the President to ignore that organization in the distribution of patronage. They do not want it to get even a cold potato, much less a piece of pie.

What says Mr. Wilson?

It is the policy of Mr. Wilson, Mr. Wilson cannot have forgotten Baltimore, and to remember Baltimore is to remember Tammany. Mr. Murphy did his best at the national convention against Mr. Wilson, and only the nerve and staying quality of Mr. Wilson's campaign made him a man of triumph.

It was Mr. Wilson's denunciation of the anti-Wilson influences at work through the New Jersey delegation that saved the day for the Jersey candidate.

Tammany, it is true, accepted the ticket with good grace and worked for its success in November. The organization, in all its history, has seldom been irregular. It has bestirred itself more in some campaigns than in others, but, generally, it has done its best for the party. Last year it managed to get the braves to the polls.

But while Mr. Wilson has no ground to love Tammany, and may even feel a repugnance to such company, there is reason why at this time he should be cautious about administering punishment. A man who has a full bill of particulars from those who have outgrown it. What, in detail, would they put in its place? What, in their opinion, is the full demand of the times?

And maybe the Constitution will survive. Still, let us have a full bill of particulars from those who have outgrown it. What, in detail, would they put in its place? What, in their opinion, is the full demand of the times?

The Housing of Diplomats.

Opposition is expressed in some quarters to the idea of providing funds for the rental of homes for ambassadors and ministers at foreign capitals and for furnishing and equipping them. It is suggested that foreign representatives are no longer as foreign as they once were; that the state department and foreign offices, by direct communications, are able to carry on most of the important business between the nations, and the ambassadors and ministers are left to the foreign capital as a mere show.

It is to be obtained, the logical step is to abandon all of the embassies and legations and to establish merely consular agents at the foreign capitals for the transaction of the actual business of international relations.

The United States would readier if an object of wonderment on the part of all the world. This would certainly be a very risky undertaking. This country has now such widespread interests, covering all parts of the world, that it should be quite certain of full representation everywhere, and unless it is definitely going out of business as a world power it cannot afford to reduce its communications to the basis of mails and cables. If ambassadors and ministers are to be abandoned, the foreign capital that they should be decently provided with the necessities of life. It is practically impossible for a man to occupy one of these positions without some personal sacrifice. The only way in which he can maintain his position and draw his salary is by private funds. It is in quarters scarcely comparable with those occupied by the representatives of fifth rate states. Thus, short of the reduction of our diplomatic representation to a bare consular basis, the United States is compelled under the present arrangement to name for these positions men who are able and willing to pay for adequate housing out of their own pockets. The way out for the government to provide its representatives with adequate quarters.

In several states it seems desirable to go to some pains to impress the fact that no true lady puts arsenic in her husband's coffee.

Harry Thaw continues to demonstrate that consignment to Matteawan does not necessarily imply a retirement from public life.

The Dingley Law.

For the purpose probably of "rattling" the democrats, there is a revival of the notion that only the war with Spain successfully prosecuted under a republican administration, saved that party from defeat in 1900. Mr. McKinley won on the prestige of a military success. Otherwise, the Dingley tariff law would have defeated him.

Mr. McKinley would have won if America and Spain had exchanged bouquets instead of bullets about Cuba. The war had nothing to do with his re-election. The conflict had not been a partisan one, except in so far as the democrats claimed they had forced the administration into action. Champ Clark

declared that the democrats had taken the republicans by "the scruff of the neck" and made them fight. But that, of course, was a mere flourish; "a tease" in debate.

The war once begun—reluctantly on Mr. McKinley's part—had been prosecuted with vigor, both democrats and republicans responding with enthusiasm, and in the campaign of 1900 this fact stood out plainly. Had he tried, Mr. McKinley could not have made good solely or principally on his part in it.

He won largely on the Dingley law. He had come in four years before on a promise of tariff revision which would "reopen the mills," and the Dingley law, in part shaped and signed by him, had accomplished that purpose. By 1900, business, which had languished under the Cleveland administration, was again booming, and labor, which had been on its uppers, was again employed, and earning more than three times a day if it so desired.

The law had succeeded because it had been honestly drawn in redemption of a campaign promise made after an honest study of business needs and conditions. It was not a mere flourish, it was protection, and here it was, undisturbed in legislation. And protection had proved to be the remedy for the Cleveland fight. Hence the strength of the republican appeal when Mr. McKinley offered for reelection.

The lesson in that record for the democrats at this time is that honesty is the best policy. Huggmugger, when it succeeds at all, succeeds but for a day. The republicans, believing in protection, promised it, and, having promised it, gave it. They were rewarded with a long lease of power. They won in that year, again in 1900, again in 1904 and again in 1908.

The democrats last year diagnosed the case too much protection, they proposed tariff revision, and revenue laws, and tariff revision, and revenue laws. Let them keep their promise now, and abide by the result. Huggmugger wins, when at all, but temporarily. They played that game twenty years ago, and lost by it. Better lose, if loss is to come, by a square reversion to square dealing, than by a trickery compromise. A compromise is necessary, and will be made, but a tricky one will be disastrous to its inventors.

Mr. Wilson and Tammany.

New York democrats opposed to Tammany are asking the President to ignore that organization in the distribution of patronage. They do not want it to get even a cold potato, much less a piece of pie.

What says Mr. Wilson?

It is the policy of Mr. Wilson, Mr. Wilson cannot have forgotten Baltimore, and to remember Baltimore is to remember Tammany. Mr. Murphy did his best at the national convention against Mr. Wilson, and only the nerve and staying quality of Mr. Wilson's campaign made him a man of triumph.

It was Mr. Wilson's denunciation of the anti-Wilson influences at work through the New Jersey delegation that saved the day for the Jersey candidate.

Tammany, it is true, accepted the ticket with good grace and worked for its success in November. The organization, in all its history, has seldom been irregular. It has bestirred itself more in some campaigns than in others, but, generally, it has done its best for the party. Last year it managed to get the braves to the polls.

But while Mr. Wilson has no ground to love Tammany, and may even feel a repugnance to such company, there is reason why at this time he should be cautious about administering punishment. A man who has a full bill of particulars from those who have outgrown it. What, in detail, would they put in its place? What, in their opinion, is the full demand of the times?

And maybe the Constitution will survive. Still, let us have a full bill of particulars from those who have outgrown it. What, in detail, would they put in its place? What, in their opinion, is the full demand of the times?

The Housing of Diplomats.

Opposition is expressed in some quarters to the idea of providing funds for the rental of homes for ambassadors and ministers at foreign capitals and for furnishing and equipping them. It is suggested that foreign representatives are no longer as foreign as they once were; that the state department and foreign offices, by direct communications, are able to carry on most of the important business between the nations, and the ambassadors and ministers are left to the foreign capital as a mere show.

It is to be obtained, the logical step is to abandon all of the embassies and legations and to establish merely consular agents at the foreign capitals for the transaction of the actual business of international relations.

The United States would readier if an object of wonderment on the part of all the world. This would certainly be a very risky undertaking. This country has now such widespread interests, covering all parts of the world, that it should be quite certain of full representation everywhere, and unless it is definitely going out of business as a world power it cannot afford to reduce its communications to the basis of mails and cables. If ambassadors and ministers are to be abandoned, the foreign capital that they should be decently provided with the necessities of life. It is practically impossible for a man to occupy one of these positions without some personal sacrifice. The only way in which he can maintain his position and draw his salary is by private funds. It is in quarters scarcely comparable with those occupied by the representatives of fifth rate states. Thus, short of the reduction of our diplomatic representation to a bare consular basis, the United States is compelled under the present arrangement to name for these positions men who are able and willing to pay for adequate housing out of their own pockets. The way out for the government to provide its representatives with adequate quarters.

In several states it seems desirable to go to some pains to impress the fact that no true lady puts arsenic in her husband's coffee.

Harry Thaw continues to demonstrate that consignment to Matteawan does not necessarily imply a retirement from public life.

The Dingley Law.

For the purpose probably of "rattling" the democrats, there is a revival of the notion that only the war with Spain successfully prosecuted under a republican administration, saved that party from defeat in 1900. Mr. McKinley won on the prestige of a military success. Otherwise, the Dingley tariff law would have defeated him.

Mr. McKinley would have won if America and Spain had exchanged bouquets instead of bullets about Cuba. The war had nothing to do with his re-election. The conflict had not been a partisan one, except in so far as the democrats claimed they had forced the administration into action. Champ Clark

declared that the democrats had taken the republicans by "the scruff of the neck" and made them fight. But that, of course, was a mere flourish; "a tease" in debate.

The war once begun—reluctantly on Mr. McKinley's part—had been prosecuted with vigor, both democrats and republicans responding with enthusiasm, and in the campaign of 1900 this fact stood out plainly. Had he tried, Mr. McKinley could not have made good solely or principally on his part in it.

He won largely on the Dingley law. He had come in four years before on a promise of tariff revision which would "reopen the mills," and the Dingley law, in part shaped and signed by him, had accomplished that purpose. By 1900, business, which had languished under the Cleveland administration, was again booming, and labor, which had been on its uppers, was again employed, and earning more than three times a day if it so desired.

The law had succeeded because it had been honestly drawn in redemption of a campaign promise made after an honest study of business needs and conditions. It was not a mere flourish, it was protection, and here it was, undisturbed in legislation. And protection had proved to be the remedy for the Cleveland fight. Hence the strength of the republican appeal when Mr. McKinley offered for reelection.

The lesson in that record for the democrats at this time is that honesty is the best policy. Huggmugger, when it succeeds at all, succeeds but for a day. The republicans, believing in protection, promised it, and, having promised it, gave it. They were rewarded with a long lease of power. They won in that year, again in 1900, again in 1904 and again in 1908.

The democrats last year diagnosed the case too much protection, they proposed tariff revision, and revenue laws, and tariff revision, and revenue laws. Let them keep their promise now, and abide by the result. Huggmugger wins, when at all, but temporarily. They played that game twenty years ago, and lost by it. Better lose, if loss is to come, by a square reversion to square dealing, than by a trickery compromise. A compromise is necessary, and will be made, but a tricky one will be disastrous to its inventors.

Mr. Wilson and Tammany.

New York democrats opposed to Tammany are asking the President to ignore that organization in the distribution of patronage. They do not want it to get even a cold potato, much less a piece of pie.

What says Mr. Wilson?

It is the policy of Mr. Wilson, Mr. Wilson cannot have forgotten Baltimore, and to remember Baltimore is to remember Tammany. Mr. Murphy did his best at the national convention against Mr. Wilson, and only the nerve and staying quality of Mr. Wilson's campaign made him a man of triumph.

It was Mr. Wilson's denunciation of the anti-Wilson influences at work through the New Jersey delegation that saved the day for the Jersey candidate.

Tammany, it is true, accepted the ticket with good grace and worked for its success in November. The organization, in all its history, has seldom been irregular. It has bestirred itself more in some campaigns than in others, but, generally, it has done its best for the party. Last year it managed to get the braves to the polls.

But while Mr. Wilson has no ground to love Tammany, and may even feel a repugnance to such company, there is reason why at this time he should be cautious about administering punishment. A man who has a full bill of particulars from those who have outgrown it. What, in detail, would they put in its place? What, in their opinion, is the full demand of the times?

And maybe the Constitution will survive. Still, let us have a full bill of particulars from those who have outgrown it. What, in detail, would they put in its place? What, in their opinion, is the full demand of the times?

The Housing of Diplomats.

Opposition is expressed in some quarters to the idea of providing funds for the rental of homes for ambassadors and ministers at foreign capitals and for furnishing and equipping them. It is suggested that foreign representatives are no longer as foreign as they once were; that the state department and foreign offices, by direct communications, are able to carry on most of the important business between the nations, and the ambassadors and ministers are left to the foreign capital as a mere show.

It is to be obtained, the logical step is to abandon all of the embassies and legations and to establish merely consular agents at the foreign capitals for the transaction of the actual business of international relations.

The United States would readier if an object of wonderment on the part of all the world. This would certainly be a very risky undertaking. This country has now such widespread interests, covering all parts of the world, that it should be quite certain of full representation everywhere, and unless it is definitely going out of business as a world power it cannot afford to reduce its communications to the basis of mails and cables. If ambassadors and ministers are to be abandoned, the foreign capital that they should be decently provided with the necessities of life. It is practically impossible for a man to occupy one of these positions without some personal sacrifice. The only way in which he can maintain his position and draw his salary is by private funds. It is in quarters scarcely comparable with those occupied by the representatives of fifth rate states. Thus, short of the reduction of our diplomatic representation to a bare consular basis, the United States is compelled under the present arrangement to name for these positions men who are able and willing to pay for adequate housing out of their own pockets. The way out for the government to provide its representatives with adequate quarters.

In several states it seems desirable to go to some pains to impress the fact that no true lady puts arsenic in her husband's coffee.

Harry Thaw continues to demonstrate that consignment to Matteawan does not necessarily imply a retirement from public life.

The Dingley Law.

For the purpose probably of "rattling" the democrats, there is a revival of the notion that only the war with Spain successfully prosecuted under a republican administration, saved that party from defeat in 1900. Mr. McKinley won on the prestige of a military success. Otherwise, the Dingley tariff law would have defeated him.

Mr. McKinley would have won if America and Spain had exchanged bouquets instead of bullets about Cuba. The war had nothing to do with his re-election. The conflict had not been a partisan one, except in so far as the democrats claimed they had forced the administration into action. Champ Clark

declared that the democrats had taken the republicans by "the scruff of the neck" and made them fight. But that, of course, was a mere flourish; "a tease" in debate.

The war once begun—reluctantly on Mr. McKinley's part—had been prosecuted with vigor, both democrats and republicans responding with enthusiasm, and in the campaign of 1900 this fact stood out plainly. Had he tried, Mr. McKinley could not have made good solely or principally on his part in it.

He won largely on the Dingley law. He had come in four years before on a promise of tariff revision which would "reopen the mills," and the Dingley law, in part shaped and signed by him, had accomplished that purpose. By 1900, business, which had languished under the Cleveland administration, was again booming, and labor, which had been on its uppers, was again employed, and earning more than three times a day if it so desired.

The law had succeeded because it had been honestly drawn in redemption of a campaign promise made after an honest study of business needs and conditions. It was not a mere flourish, it was protection, and here it was, undisturbed in legislation. And protection had proved to be the remedy for the Cleveland fight. Hence the strength of the republican appeal when Mr. McKinley offered for reelection.

The lesson in that record for the democrats at this time is that honesty is the best policy. Huggmugger, when it succeeds at all, succeeds but for a day. The republicans, believing in protection, promised it, and, having promised it, gave it. They were rewarded with a long lease of power. They won in that year, again in 1900, again in 1904 and again in 1908.

The democrats last year diagnosed the case too much protection, they proposed tariff revision, and revenue laws, and tariff revision, and revenue laws. Let them keep their promise now, and abide by the result. Huggmugger wins, when at all, but temporarily. They played that game twenty years ago, and lost by it. Better lose, if loss is to come, by a square reversion to square dealing, than by a trickery compromise. A compromise is necessary, and will be made, but a tricky one will be disastrous to its inventors.

Mr. Wilson and Tammany.

New York democrats opposed to Tammany are asking the President to ignore that organization in the distribution of patronage. They do not want it to get even a cold potato, much less a piece of pie.

What says Mr. Wilson?

It is the policy of Mr. Wilson, Mr. Wilson cannot have forgotten Baltimore, and to remember Baltimore is to remember Tammany. Mr. Murphy did his best at the national convention against Mr. Wilson, and only the nerve and staying quality of Mr. Wilson's campaign made him a man of triumph.

It was Mr. Wilson's denunciation of the anti-Wilson influences at work through the New Jersey delegation that saved the day for the Jersey candidate.

Tammany, it is true, accepted the ticket with good grace and worked for its success in November. The organization, in all its history, has seldom been irregular. It has bestirred itself more in some campaigns than in others, but, generally, it has done its best for the party. Last year it managed to get the braves to the polls.

But while Mr. Wilson has no ground to love Tammany, and may even feel a repugnance to such company, there is reason why at this time he should be cautious about administering punishment. A man who has a full bill of particulars from those who have outgrown it. What, in detail, would they put in its place? What, in their opinion, is the full demand of the times?

And maybe the Constitution will survive. Still, let us have a full bill of particulars from those who have outgrown it. What, in detail, would they put in its place? What, in their opinion, is the full demand of the times?

The Housing of Diplomats.

Opposition is expressed in some quarters to the idea of providing funds for the rental of homes for ambassadors and ministers at foreign capitals and for furnishing and equipping them. It is suggested that foreign representatives are no longer as foreign as they once were; that the state department and foreign offices, by direct communications, are able to carry on most of the important business between the nations, and the ambassadors and ministers are left to the foreign capital as a mere show.

It is to be obtained, the logical step is to abandon all of the embassies and legations and to establish merely consular agents at the foreign capitals for the transaction of the actual business of international relations.

The United States would readier if an object of wonderment on the part of all the world. This would certainly be a very risky undertaking. This country has now such widespread interests, covering all parts of the world, that it should be quite certain of full representation everywhere, and unless it is definitely going out of business as a world power it cannot afford to reduce its communications to